UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR		ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/435,677	05/05/95	KNIGHT	H	04860.P1638

LM21/0102

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD 7TH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES CA 90025

EXAMINER
KRICK,R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2782	8

DATE MAILED: 01/02/98

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _Oct 6, 1997_____.

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire ____3____ month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

    ☒ Claim(s) _1-21_____ is/are pending in the application.

        Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

    ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

    ☒ Claim(s) _1, 2, 9-14, and 16-21_____ is/are rejected.

    ☒ Claim(s) _3-8 and 15_____ is/are objected to.

    ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

    ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

    ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

    ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐approved ☐disapproved.

    ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

    ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

    ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

        ☐All ☐Some* ☐None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

            ☐ received.

            ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____ .

            ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

        *Certified copies not received: _____ .

    ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

    ☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

    ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

    ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

    ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

    ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- *SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES* ---

Response to Amendment

1.   Applicant's Request for Reconsideration filed on 09

October 1997 has been received and considered. The

following rejections now apply.

2.   Claims 1, 2, 9-14, and 16-21 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over applicant's

admission of prior art, in view of Taylor et al, patent no.

5,537,466, further in view of Bennett et al, patent no.

4,908,859.

3.   Taylor et al were cited as prior art in the previous

office action.

4.   Claims 3-8 and 15 are objected to as being dependent

upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if

rewritten in independent form including all of the

limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

5.   As to claim 1, applicant admits to a bus, at least one

memory coupled to the bus for storing data and programming

instructions that comprise applications and an operating

system, and a processing unit coupled to the bus and running

the operating system and applications by executing

programming instructions [applicants' disclosure, pages 1-

2].

6.   However, applicant does not admit to an application

having a first plurality of tailored distinct programming

interfaces available to access a plurality of separate sets

of I/O services provided through the operating system.

7.   . Taylor et al teach an application having a first

plurality of distinct programming interfaces available to

access a plurality of separate sets of I/O services provided

through the operating system [col. 4 lines 18-28 and col. 5

lines 6-27]. As also indicated by the applicants, Taylor et

al teach multiple instances of application programming

interfaces, each of which is a version/instance of the

complete API. Taylor et al do not **explicitly** teach a

plurality of <u>tailored</u> distinct programming interfaces.

8.   <u>Bennett et al</u> teach a plurality of tailored separate

interface channels for carrying different types of services

containing different combinations of the service components
[col. 1 lines 22-44 and col. 2 lines 63-68].

9.   It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in
the art at the time of the invention to combine teachings of
Taylor et al, Bennett et al, and applicant's knowledge to
prior art because Taylor et al's application program
interface arrangement would have increased efficiency and
provided improved architecture of existing prior art
systems, and Bennett et al's tailored separate interfaces
for different types of services would have accommodated
common set of services to be handled by distinct interfaces
thus taking advantage of similar characteristics when
handling service requests.

10.   As to claim 2, Bennett et al teach each of the first
plurality of tailored distinct programming interfaces are
tailored to a type of I/O service provided by each set of
I/O services [abstract].

11.   As to claim 9, in addition to the limitations stated in
claim 1, Bennett et al further teach each tailored distinct

program structure comprising a first programming interface
for receiving service requests for a set of I/O services of
a first type, a first server coupled to receive service
requests and to dispatch service requests to the I/O
services, an activation model to define an operating
environment in which a server request is to be serviced by
the set of I/O services [col. 2 line 30 - col. 3 line 22],
and at least one specific instance of the set of I/O
services that operate within the activation model [col. 3
lines 49-54].

12.   As to claims 10 and 11, Taylor et al teach the first
programming interface is responsive to request from
applications and from other program structures, and the
first programming interface comprises at least one library
for converting functions into messages [col. 3 lines 4-21
and col. 5 lines 1-65].

13.   As to claim 12, Taylor et al teach the first server
receives a message corresponding to a service request from
the first programming interface, maps the message into a

function called by the client, and then calls the function [col. 6 lines 26-44].

14.   As to claims 13 and 14, Taylor et al teach the message comprises a kernel message, and wherein one of the at least one specific instance comprises a service that accesses another program structure [col. 4 line 30 - col. 5 line 27].

15.   As to claims 16-18, Bennett et al teach two or more I/O services share code or data (basic service type, col. 4 lines 51-55), the two or more I/O services are of different types (variants in characteristics, col. 4 lines 51-55), and the program structure further comprises a storage mechanism to maintain identification of available services to which access is provided via the first server (service definition table, col. 2 lines 56-62 and col. 3 lines 9-14).

16.   Claims 19-21 are the corresponding method claims of claims 9-10, and therefore, are rejected under the same rationale.

17.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2, 9-

14, and 16-21 have been considered but are deemed to be moot

in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

> Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
> Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

> (703) 308-9051, (for formal communications
> intended for entry)

Or:

> (703) 308-5359 (for informal or draft
> communications, please label "PROPOSED" or
> "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,
Arlington. VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Art Unit: 2782

18.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rehana Perveen, whose telephone number is (703) 305-8476. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 8:00 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas C. Lee, can be reached at (703) 305-9717. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-5359.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

Rehana Perveen
December 12, 1997

THOMAS C. LEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
230